

## CHAPTER 3: IMPACT OF THE CAHSEE REQUIREMENT ON INSTRUCTION AND REMEDIATION

### Introduction

Results from the survey of instruction and the interviews to confirm and extend survey results are presented in the next three chapters. Chapter 3 provides a description of the courses and programs of instruction found in our survey. Particular attention is given to the impact that the CAHSEE requirement may have had on changes in curriculum and instruction. The focus of Chapter 4 is on the effectiveness of the courses and programs, primarily at the high school level, for the Class of 2004. Further analyses of the potential effectiveness of both high school and middle-grade feeder school instruction for subsequent classes are described in Chapter 5.

Before turning to information about specific courses, we present a brief description of the schools responding to the survey and the schools in which interviews were conducted in the validation effort.

### Surveys

As described in Chapter 1, HumRRO conducted a survey of high school principals and teachers and of principals and teachers at schools feeding into the high schools. Copies of the survey instruments are provided in Appendix A in Volume 2.

### Response Sample

**Schools.** A sample of 600 schools was selected to represent the entire state. The sample was stratified by district so that at least one school was included from each of the 483 high school districts that include grade 10. The sampling design also assured that, across all districts, the sample would match overall state distributions for academic performance (based on results from the 2002 10<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA STAR assessment), school size, and the percent of English learners (EL). Responses were obtained from 298 of the 600 high schools (50%) in the original sample including 263 of the state's 483 school districts that include grade 10 (54%). Appendix C in Volume 2 contains the response frequency tables for the survey results.

Table 3.1 shows the distribution of high schools participating in the survey in comparison to the original sample. Slightly fewer of the responders were small schools, probably because small schools had fewer personnel resources to devote to the survey. Also, schools with relatively high passing rates were somewhat more likely to respond. Nonetheless, the sample of responders includes schools at each level in terms of size and CAHSEE passing rates.

Survey responses were also received for 173 middle-grade feeder schools. We attempted to find one middle-grade feeder school for each high school in the sample, but some of the high schools were continuation or other special schools that received students from other high schools more than from middle-grade feeder schools. In addition, interest in the middle-grade feeder schools appears to be more focused on the content standards overall rather than

more specifically on the CAHSEE, which is a greater interest at the high school level. Table 3.2 shows characteristics of the high schools for which middle-grade feeder school responses were obtained.

Table 3.1 Sample Characteristics by Response Status (High Schools)

School Category	% in Sample	% of Responders
School Size (2002 Grade 10 Enrollment)		
1–99	23%	20%
100–500	44%	49%
> 500	33%	32%
CAHSEE ELA Pass Rates (Through Jan. 2003)		
< 50%	11%	8%
50–75%	14%	11%
> 75%	75%	81%
CAHSEE Math Pass Rates (Through Jan. 2003)		
< 50%	26%	21%
50–75%	34%	33%
> 75%	40%	48%
CAHSEE ELA Pass Rates for Special Education Students		
< 20%	8%	5%
20–50%	30%	28%
> 50 %	62%	67%
CAHSEE Math Pass Rates for Special Education Students		
< 20%	27%	23%
20–50%	40%	42%
> 50 %	33%	35%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.2 Characteristics of High Schools by Middle-Grade Feeder School Response Status

School Category	% in Sample	% of Responders
School Size (2002 Grade 10 Enrollment)		
1–99	23%	17%
100–500	44%	42%
> 500	33%	42%
CAHSEE ELA Pass Rates (Through Jan. 2003)		
< 50%	11%	5%
50–75%	14%	9%
> 75%	75%	85%
CAHSEE Math Pass Rates (Through Jan. 2003)		
< 50%	26%	16%
50–75%	34%	37%
> 75%	40%	48%
CAHSEE ELA Pass Rates for Special Education Students		
< 20%	8%	6%
20–50%	30%	26%
> 50 %	62%	68%
CAHSEE Math Pass Rates for Special Education Students		
< 20%	27%	24%
20–50%	40%	44%
> 50 %	33%	33%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

## Site Visit Interviews

Site visits were conducted at 45 high schools—including charter, continuation, and juvenile authority—and 17 middle-grade feeder schools, resulting in 499 total interviews. (Interview protocols are provided in Appendix B in Volume 2.) Survey and interview data were collected from principals, ELA teachers, and mathematics teachers. Respondents were asked to focus on “initial or primary” instruction on the standards covered by the CAHSEE and on “remedial or intervention” instruction. Interviews also were conducted with high school and middle-grade feeder school special education (SE) teachers, EL teachers, the CAHSEE remediation teachers (high school only), and special program teachers.

Interviews were analyzed using N5, produced by QSR International Pty. Ltd. (QSR), (formerly known as NUD\*IST, or Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing), the fifth version of a qualitative data analysis software program that allows researchers to develop their own coding system using a hierarchical tree design. Prior to the site visits, a preliminary coding scheme for the interviews was developed that included some demographic information, such as interview type (principal, math teacher, special education teacher, etc.) and school level (high school, middle-grade feeder school, etc.). QSR refers to this information as “base data.” The scheme also included coding by content, or what was being said. In QSR each item in the hierarchical tree is called a “node,” and each node has a unique “address.” The hierarchical tree can be changed as needed during the life of the project; for example, nodes can be added, deleted, moved, or merged with one another. Both automatic and highlighting QSR coding methods were used on this project. Selected results

from the interviews are presented in this chapter. Refer to Appendix D in Volume 2 for the complete summary of interview responses.

Sixty-five documents were coded as principal interviews. Of those documents, 50 were coded as high school principals and 15 as middle-grade feeder school principals. In five high schools, researchers conducted separate interviews with the principal and an assistant principal; both these interviews were coded as principal interviews, thus accounting for the difference between the number of principals (50) and the number of high schools (45). At only one middle-grade feeder school did we fail to obtain an interview with a principal.

We interviewed 86 high school and “other” ELA teachers, 36 middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers, 86 high school and “other” math teachers, and 35 middle-grade feeder school math teachers and entered their responses into the database.

### **Findings at the School Level**

In addition to supplying a list of relevant courses, principals responded to a number of questions about their curriculum in general. Specific questions included the extent to which instruction covering the California Content Standards, including those assessed by the CAHSEE, has increased over the past several years; how student mastery of these standards is tracked; and how coordination with middle-grade feeder schools on curriculum issues is handled.

## **Increasing Coverage of the California Content Standards**

### **Survey Results**

Principals reported increasing coverage of both the ELA and the mathematics content standards for CAHSEE (at the high school level) and the California Content Standards in general (at the middle-grade feeder school level) as shown in Tables 3.3 through 3.6. Since CAHSEE blueprints were adopted in December 2000, the percentage of schools reporting *High* (at least 90%) coverage of the standards has risen from about 5 percent to 50 percent. Similarly, the percentage of schools reporting at least *fair* coverage (75% or more) has risen from about 19 percent to about 83 percent. Reported increases in the coverage of the California Content Standards at the middle-grade feeder school level show similar very significant increases.

Table 3.3 High School Principal Report of Coverage of CAHSEE ELA Standards

School Year	Percent of CAHSEE ELA Standards Covered				
	< 25%	25–74%	75–90%	> 90%	Missing/Unknown
Before 1999	15%	27%	15%	4%	40%
1999–2000	13%	34%	23%	7%	23%
2000–2001	6%	37%	32%	12%	14%
2001–2002	2%	23%	42%	26%	8%
2002–2003	0%	11%	34%	49%	6%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.4 High School Principal Report of Coverage of CAHSEE Mathematics Standards

School Year	Percent of CAHSEE Mathematics Standards Covered				
	< 25%	25–74%	75–90%	> 90%	Missing/Unknown
Before 1999	14%	27%	15%	5%	39%
1999–2000	14%	30%	23%	8%	24%
2000–2001	6%	35%	31%	13%	15%
2001–2002	3%	22%	38%	29%	8%
2002–2003	1%	11%	31%	50%	7%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.5 Middle-Grade Feeder School Principal Report of Coverage of California ELA Content Standards

School Year	Percent of California ELA Content Standards Covered				
	< 25%	25–74%	75–90%	> 90%	Missing/Unknown
Before 1999	15%	30%	13%	4%	38%
1999–2000	15%	39%	21%	6%	19%
2000–2001	6%	38%	31%	13%	12%
2001–2002	1%	22%	50%	20%	7%
2002–2003	0%	5%	43%	49%	3%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 3.6 Middle-Grade Feeder School Principal Report of Coverage of California Mathematics Content Standards

School Year	Percent of California Mathematics Content Standards Covered				
	< 25%	25–74%	75–90%	> 90%	Missing/Unknown
Before 1999	13%	30%	16%	4%	38%
1999–2000	11%	35%	26%	6%	21%
2000–2001	3%	37%	36%	11%	13%
2001–2002	1%	18%	48%	25%	8%
2002–2003	0%	7%	44%	46%	3%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

In addition to asking about general coverage of standards, we asked how the districts, schools, and/or teachers track mastery of each standard for each individual student. Table 3.7 shows the responses to this question in the principal surveys. Note that in some cases more than one method was marked indicating either shared or multilevel systems. Overall, 95 percent reported some system for monitoring mastery of specific content standards.

Table 3.7. How is Student Mastery of Content Standards Tracked?

Approach	Percent of Principals Selecting Each Option	
	High School	Middle-Grade Feeder School
Tracked by the District	27%	52%
Tracked by the School	34%	49%
Tracked by Departments	30%	38%
Tracked by Teachers	56%	74%
Other System for Tracking	5%	5%
No System for Tracking	5%	5%

Principals were also asked about coordination with the middle-grade feeder school curriculum, coordination between special programs and their general education program, and coordination between alternative or continuation school programs and their general education program. Table 3.8 summarizes their responses to these questions.

Table 3.8. How Fully Developed is Coordination Among Various Programs?

Coordination between:	Percent of Principals Responding			
	Fully Developed	Partially Developed	Not Developed	Not Applicable
High School Principals				
Feeder School and High School	14%	65%	17%	3%
Special Ed. And General Ed.	18%	73%	6%	3%
EL Staff and General Ed.	16%	58%	13%	13%
Alt./Cont. and General Ed.	9%	48%	24%	19%
Middle-Grade Feeder School Principals				
Feeder School and High School	26%	62%	13%	0%
Special Ed. And General Ed.	29%	64%	6%	1%
EL Staff and General Ed.	24%	61%	7%	7%
Alt./Cont. and General Ed.	6%	29%	20%	45%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

### Site Visits

In the interviews, we asked principals a series of questions regarding the use of standards-based instruction (SBI) in their schools. First, they discussed when SBI had been implemented. Next, the principals rated on a scale of 1 to 5 (1—not at all implemented, 5—fully implemented) where they felt they were in the implementation process and how long it would take before they were fully implemented. Finally, we asked how they monitored students' mastery of standards and how they assisted students who did not master standards. Responses to each of these questions are summarized here.

#### When was standards-based instruction implemented?

Responses to this question varied from as recently as 1 year ago to as many as 6 years ago, with 34 high school principals responding with an average response of 3.0 years. It is important to note that some responses were difficult to interpret cleanly or with absolute certainty. For example, some schools or districts began implementing standards-based instruction in only one department and gradually phased it in over several years in the remaining departments. There was evidence that in some instances a motivated teacher

served as the initiator of SBI within his or her department, and that implementation then gradually spread to other departments at the school. So, while one department may indeed have been using SBI for 4 or 5 years, other departments in the same school may have less experience with it. In other cases, principals who had arrived at their school in the past couple of years typically found that SBI had already been implemented at least to some degree, but they were unable to state with certainty when SBI actually began at their school.

What rate of implementation has your school achieved?

The 36 high school principals responding to this question gave themselves an average rating of 3.6. Many felt that with a little more time, perhaps 2 years or so, they would be able to report a higher rating. Many principals reported that implementation varies among content areas, therefore providing different ratings for specific content areas. This raised the question of whether one particular content area, English or mathematics, would have consistently high or low implementation ratings. After further review, no such pattern was found. Thirteen middle-grade feeder school principals responded to this question with an average response of 3.7 years.

When will standards-based instruction be fully in effect?

Twenty-four principals gave specific timeframe estimates resulting in an average response of 18 years. Five principals discussed the difficulty of getting teachers to “buy into” SBI, while one each mentioned the importance of working with the teachers’ union and ensuring that other supporting changes are made. In this case, the supporting change was the creation of a standards-based report card. The recognition of additional supporting changes is one of the eight stages in the change process posited by Kotter in his books, *Leading Change* (1996) and *The Heart of Change* (2002).

The average middle-grade feeder school principal responses were very similar to the high school principal responses: 1.8 years to fully implement standards-based instruction. Their challenges were, again, similar to what the high schools reported.

How do you track mastery of content standards?

Mastery of standards goes beyond simply being exposed to the standards. It implies that students are being held to a certain level of performance before being able to advance to other classes and that they are provided with opportunities for remediation if they do not achieve mastery. The principals we interviewed reported a variety of methods being used to track student mastery as well as to remediate students who do not master the standards. Thirty-three high school principals discussed systems either in place or currently being developed to track student mastery of the California Content Standards. The most frequently mentioned method of tracking student mastery, with 18 responses, is the development of common semester finals, end-of-course finals, or benchmark exams. The second most commonly mentioned method described, with 13 responses, is the use of standardized tests to track student mastery.

There were 13 middle-grade feeder school principal responses to the “mastery of standards” question. As was found in the high school principal responses, most middle-grade feeder school principals reported using several methods, ranging from individual teacher efforts to those imposed by the district. Six principals reported using or currently developing



some form of common assignment, rubrics, or benchmark tests to measure the mastery of standards. These common measures may have been created at the school or district level. Six principals also reported using results from standardized tests as a measure of mastery.

Have you made changes in the curriculum as a result of SBI?

High school principals described efforts to target students considered at risk of not passing the CAHSEE (14 comments) as well as efforts to remediate students who had already had not passed the CAHSEE (20 comments) by placing them in the CAHSEE remediation courses. One alternative school noted that focusing on at-risk students and those who had not passed the CAHSEE is not anything different than what they have always done. Principals then described their efforts to coordinate instruction across the curriculum, for example greater consistency from class to class, more alignment of classes across the board, and more consistency across curriculum at school and district levels. Another issue was the apparent narrowing of the curriculum in response to SBI: principals cited concern for the loss of elective classes that are important to many students. Other issues mentioned by high school principals begin with comments regarding their efforts to make Algebra more accessible to students (19 comments). This entailed the addition of various math programs (e.g., Essentials in Math), two-year Algebra 1 classes, and a variety of after school and weekend workshops. Another issue (five principal comments) was the concern to provide good professional development opportunities for teachers. And finally, there were two comments regarding new programs that are designed for parents. These programs provide information on parenting, life skills, reading, and job-seeking skills.

Middle-grade feeder school principals presented similar comments on similar topics as the high school principals. Six of the middle-grade feeder school principals specifically noted they have or are planning to obtain textbooks that are aligned with the state standards. Middle-grade feeder school principals also reported targeting at-risk students (five comments), concerns with the loss of electives in response to focusing more on SBI (five comments), and efforts to bring Algebra into their programs (five comments).

How do teachers ensure coverage both across and within grades?

Teachers sometimes described these articulation efforts in very general terms, such as attending department meetings, and sometimes in more specific terms, such as using a benchmark exam or pacing guide (within same grade/course) or meeting with middle-grade feeder school teachers in their subject (across grades/courses). We used these three categories—general, within, and across—to sort responses. Table 3.9 shows that high school ELA and math teachers most frequently mentioned some form of within grade/course articulation.

Table 3.9. Type of Articulation by Subject—High School Teachers

Subject Area	General Articulation	Within Grade/Course	Across Grade/Course	Lack of Articulation
ELA	24	35	25	25
Math	20	45	26	12

Middle-grade feeder school teachers also were asked about articulation, and a similar analysis procedure of responses was used, placing responses into general, within



grade/course, and across grade/course categories. There were 29 and 22 responses from middle-grade feeder school ELA and math teachers, respectively. Table 3.10 shows slight differences between ELA and math, with math responses grouped more tightly among the three categories than are ELA responses. We note that middle-grade feeder school responses were very similar to high school responses, with general articulation indicating some type of reliance on standards, text, or generic department meeting; meeting with same-grade/subject teachers or use of benchmarks or common exams indicating within grade/course articulation, and meeting with teachers in other grades or courses as examples of across grade/course articulation.

Table 3.10. Type of Articulation by Subject—Middle-Grade Feeder School Teachers

Subject Area	General Articulation	Within Grade/Course	Across Grade/Course	Lack of Articulation
ELA	10	20	12	6
Math	12	10	9	5

### Information about Specific Courses

Survey data were received on a total 5,276 middle-grade feeder school and high school courses or programs. Table 3.11 shows the breakout of courses by subject for each school level. Of course, many of the courses had the same titles, but were taught in different schools, possibly using different texts and/or covering different portions of the texts that were used. Obviously, one of the challenges in evaluating the adequacy of instruction is analyzing in any depth the very large number of different courses in which CAHSEE Content Standards are covered.

Table 3.11. Number of Courses Covered with Survey Responses by School Level and Subject

School Level	ELA	Math	Total
Middle-Grade Feeder School	1,089	917	2,006
High School	1,894	1,376	3,270
Total	2,983	2,293	5,276

The teacher survey included information on specific courses. Courses were classified by subject (ELA or mathematics) and by course type (primary course taken by most students, an alternative to the primary course, a supplemental or remedial course, and other courses or programs). We also looked at whether the course targeted primarily special education students (> 50 % of course enrollment), English learners (> 50% of course enrollment), or students in general (the remaining courses). Table 3.12 shows the distribution of courses across these categories.

At the high school level, 13 percent of the ELA courses and 10 percent of the mathematics courses targeted special education students and 9 percent of the ELA courses and 14 percent of the mathematics courses targeted English learners. Note that the number of courses may not be indicative of the number of students taking these courses. There might be a single ESL course taken by most or all English learners and several different mathematics courses targeting this population, each with many fewer sections and lower total enrollment.

Table 3.12. Distribution of Courses by Subject, Type, and Students Served

Course Type	Number of Courses	Percent of Courses Targeting Special Populations		
		Special Educ.	Engl. Learners	Not Targeted
High School ELA Courses				
Primary	1,055	1%	8%	90%
Alternative	403	18%	44%	38%
Suppl./Remedial	280	14%	30%	57%
Other	156	13%	23%	64%
Total	1,894	13%	9%	64%
High School Mathematics Courses				
Primary	618	2%	11%	87%
Alternative	396	18%	14%	69%
Suppl./Remedial	237	17%	17%	66%
Other	125	11%	20%	69%
Total	1,376	10%	14%	76%
Middle-Grade Feeder School ELA Courses				
Primary	626	1%	12%	87%
Alternative	238	27%	47%	26%
Suppl./Remedial	143	12%	35%	53%
Other	76	7%	22%	71%
Total	1,083	8%	24%	68%
Middle-Grade Feeder School Mathematics Courses				
Primary	624	1%	11%	88%
Alternative	167	29%	18%	53%
Suppl./Remedial	68	24%	15%	62%
Other	58	7%	9%	84%
Total	917	8%	13%	79%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

The majority of courses described in our survey were regular, long-established courses. Some courses, however, particularly courses targeting special education students and English learners, were more recently developed. Table 3.13 shows the distribution of each type of course by the year in which the course was first introduced.

At the high school level, more than a quarter of the ELA courses and a third of the mathematics courses targeting special populations were introduced in the past two years. The majority of these were new in the 2002-2003 school year. At the middle-grade feeder school level, recent development has been relatively even across the different course types. Significantly more of the middle-grade feeder school mathematics courses were introduced in the past three years. This is likely the result of efforts to accelerate the mathematics curriculum so that Algebra can be taught at the 8<sup>th</sup> rather than 9<sup>th</sup> grade.

Table 3.13. Year Each Type of Course was Introduced

Table 3-15: Year Each Type of Course Was Introduced						
Population Targeted	Number of Courses	Percent Introduced:				
		Before 1999	1999–2000	2000–2001	2001–2002	2002–2003
High School ELA Courses						
Special Education	135	64%	4%	5%	10%	16%
English Learners	379	63%	5%	5%	8%	20%
Not Targeted	1,319	78%	5%	4%	6%	7%
High School Mathematics Courses						
Special Education	128	54%	6%	6%	12%	23%
English Learners	183	47%	4%	9%	15%	24%
Not Targeted	1,013	61%	7%	6%	13%	14%
Middle-Grade Feeder School ELA Courses						
Special Education	89	66%	7%	10%	7%	10%
English Learners	250	69%	3%	8%	8%	11%
Not Targeted	718	73%	6%	5%	5%	11%
Middle-Grade Feeder School Mathematics Courses						
Special Education	75	65%	3%	9%	9%	13%
English Learners	111	47%	5%	20%	16%	13%
Not Targeted	696	53%	7%	10%	17%	13%

NOTE: Percent totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

### Coverage of Targeted Standards

We asked teachers the extent to which each course was aligned with the content standards that the course was intended to cover. For about half of the courses, teachers indicated that the alignment was very great (more than 90%). Teachers were also asked when the textbook for the course was adopted. As shown in Table 3.14, there was a clear relationship between how recently the textbook was adopted and the likelihood that the course would be rated as having very great alignment.

Table 3.14 Course Coverage of Content Standards by Year Textbook Was Adopted

Year Textbook was Adopted	ELA		Mathematics	
	No. of Courses	Percent with Very Great Alignment	No. of Courses	Percent with Very Great Alignment
High School Courses				
2002–2003	288	67%	141	72%
2001–2002	159	54%	330	65%
2000–2001	126	49%	160	63%
1999–2000	108	44%	71	44%
Before 1999	489	37%	303	50%
N.A. (no Text)	366	38%	151	39%
Total	1,536	46%	1,156	57%
Middle-Grade Feeder School Courses				
2002–2003	346	74%	136	77%
2001–2002	139	64%	329	66%
2000–2001	49	37%	127	65%
1999–2000	58	38%	58	62%
Before 1999	216	36%	87	54%
N.A. (no Text)	120	36%	67	40%
Total	928	54%	804	64%

### Site Visits

**High School Teacher Interviews.** There was a surprising range of answers to the question, *When did this course begin using Standards-Based Instruction (SBI)?* Answers at each end of the range proved difficult to analyze with accuracy. Several experienced teachers, for example, stated that they had always used SBI throughout their careers, some of which began as long as 30 years ago. In further comment, most of these teachers explained that they had always followed an established curriculum guide, most often developed by their districts.

Since our focus is on the Class of 2004, the question becomes: Were the teachers using SBI for these students? For high school teachers to have used SBI for the Class of 2004, the 9<sup>th</sup> grade teachers would have had to start during the 2000–2001 school year. In an attempt to get a school response, we grouped teachers' responses by school. We coded responses into three categories: (a) started before the Class of 2004, (b) probably started with the Class of 2004, and (c) started after the Class of 2004.

### English-Language Arts

Sixty-two ELA teachers at 37 high schools provided an answer to the question of when they started using SBI in their course. We coded responses from 14 schools as indicating that ELA teachers at the high school began using SBI prior to the Class of 2004. Responses at another 12 high schools indicated that ELA teachers at the school appeared to start using SBI with the Class of 2004. Teachers at the remaining 11 schools gave responses that indicated that they started using SBI after beginning to teach the Class of 2004 or were not using SBI.

### Mathematics

Sixty-six math teachers at 34 high schools provided an answer (that we could code) to the question of when they started using SBI in their course. We coded responses from math teachers at 15 high schools as indicating that they began using SBI prior to the Class of 2004. Responses from 13 high schools indicated that the teachers began using SBI with the Class of 2004. Responses from six high schools indicated that they began SBI after students in the Class of 2004 were 9<sup>th</sup> graders.

We asked ELA and math teachers to *rate the implementation of SBI* in their courses, using a 5-point Likert-type scale. In the scale, a 1 indicated, “not at all implemented” and a 5 indicated, “completely implemented.” Most of the 68 high school ELA teachers rated their implementation of SBI very near a 4. Most of the 72 high school math teachers rated implementation just over a 4. No high school math teachers provided a rating of ‘1.’

**Middle-Grade Feeder School Teacher Interviews.** Middle-grade feeder school teachers would have had to start using SBI in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade by school year 1998–1999 to use it with the Class of 2004. We again grouped the teacher responses by school and coded the schools in the same three categories as before.

Middle-grade feeder school teachers rated the implementation of SBI in their courses, using the same 5-point Likert-type scale as used by high school teachers. Responses for middle-grade feeder school teachers were slightly higher, with 33 middle-grade feeder school ELA teachers responding with an average of 4.4, and 31 middle-grade feeder school math teachers responding with an average of 4.9. No ratings of ‘1’ or ‘2’ were given by high school ELA or math teachers.

### English-Language Arts

For the ELA teachers, we received responses from 31 teachers from 15 middle-grade feeder schools. As could be expected, teachers from only 3 of those 15 schools indicated they started using SBI in time for the Class of 2004. We did not code any school as starting prior to the Class of 2004. Thus, responses from 12 of the 15 middle-grade feeder schools indicated that they had started using SBI after the Class of 2004. Most of the responses indicated that the schools had begun implementing SBI sometime within the last three to four years. Many times that implementation corresponded with the adoption of new textbooks.

### Mathematics

Twenty-eight math teachers at 15 middle-grade feeder schools provided responses to when they started using SBI in their courses. Only two middle-grade feeder schools’ responses indicated that the teachers had implemented SBI for the Class of 2004. We did not code any middle-grade feeder school as starting SBI prior to the Class of 2004. Responses from the remaining 12 schools were coded as starting to use SBI since the Class of 2004. Again, most responses indicated that teachers at the school started to use SBI in the last two years.

## **Remediation Programs Targeted to the CAHSEE**

The site visits included interviews with high school teachers who were working to help students having difficulty passing the CAHSEE. Interviews focused on those who had taught

courses or programs designed to help students considered at-risk of not succeeding on the CAHSEE subsequent to their taking and not passing the exit exam. In all, 21 high school teachers in this category were interviewed.

Fifteen of 21 CAHSEE remediation teachers referred to their CAHSEE remediation program as a “course”, though it was not always clear if the course was held during regular school hours or after school. Some schools had a 7<sup>th</sup> “after school” period during which they may have chosen to offer remediation. Two programs were held on Saturday, while another was described as a pull-out program held during students’ elective or gym period. Below are some comments describing how some programs/courses are organized:

- Students must take the course during their junior year if they have not passed the CAHSEE.
- The class was a 2-hour intercession course conducted from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. Monday through Friday. There were two teachers teaching 80 students in the cafeteria. This was the only class conducted during those hours in the cafeteria.
- This course is held after school so it doesn’t interfere with the other scheduled classes.
- Class is held on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Saturday for eight weeks.
- The school is doing this course on a pull-out basis—from gym or elective.

Programs ranged from 14 to 170 students being served. However, not all respondents had a complete count of students in the programs. In some situations, teachers only had a count of the number of students in their section of a remedial course.

Eighteen of 21 CAHSEE remediation teachers reported the use of the California standards in their course or program. Those few that did not refer specifically to the use of standards often spoke of using the CAHSEE released items or the CAHSEE blueprints as a means of targeting the needs of their students. Several stated that they used a standards-aligned text that helped them stay focused on standards-based instruction. Five of 21 teachers rated the implementation level for standards-based instruction within their course or program, on a 1 to 5 scale (5 being full implementation). Their average score was 4.6. The following comments provide good representation of teachers’ input regarding increasing alignment to California Content Standards:

- The district team—teachers from all the schools—focused on getting familiar with the standards. They used the standards, the exit exam blueprint—and mapped them to a course, sequenced the lessons, and produced a daily calendar for what content is covered and tested. This teacher took the course design and embellished it by formalizing lesson plans to relate directly to specific standards.
- I take it straight off the exit exam. I work on the test blueprint outline.
- The teacher lets the book keep track of the standards since it is aligned to the content standards.

The consensus among the CAHSEE remediation teachers seemed to be that accountability in itself is a good thing; some thought the Class of 2004 was ready, others did

not, and still others were somewhere in between. A few CAHSEE remediation teachers offered a prediction of when they thought students would be ready to be held accountable to the CAHSEE.

- Now that we have standards-based instruction, I would delay the CAHSEE for a year or two.
- In 6 years, if students work, they can pass the CAHSEE.

Though not all remediation courses had begun the evaluation process, several had used or planned on using student performance on the CAHSEE, or on the CAHSEE released items, as a means of measuring program effectiveness. The following responses provide examples of evaluation methods used by the CAHSEE remediation teachers:

- There are plans to look at the CAHSEE scores following student enrollment in this course.
- Passing the CAHSEE is the ultimate evaluation.
- 75 percent of summer students passed the math test.
- 60 percent of students taking this course are passing the CAHSEE on their second try.
- We will accumulate data for this course comparing the performance on the CAHSEE between students who took the remediation course and students who did not.
- The course will involve a pre- and post-test based on the released items.
- Records have not been kept on student performance after the course yet.

Other evaluation was ongoing throughout the course, including in-class testing, pre-and post-tests, individualized assignments, and keeping student work on file. Below are examples of during-class evaluation used by the CAHSEE remediation teachers:

- We can track students' performance and progress with different ways, including weekly tests and individualized assignments.
- We administer an 80-item diagnostic test at the start; students determine their status related to the standards. We give it again at the end to show progress.
- The program includes an assessment component with pre-post tests for each strand.

### **Targeted Programs for Students with Disabilities**

The interviews with Special Education teachers focused on those who were responsible for the Individualized Education Plans (IEP) or who taught primary or remedial ELA or math courses offered to special education students. A total of 72 interviews were conducted with 50 high school, 20 middle-grade feeder school, and 2 “other” special education teachers.

**High Schools.** Special education teachers in the high schools mentioned several types of assistance offered to their students in preparation for the CAHSEE, examples of which are listed here:

- |                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| • Practice tests         | • After school tutoring |
| • Remedial classes       | • Tutors                |
| • Test taking strategies | • Saturday school       |



- Study skills classes
- Lunchtime tutoring
- Summer school
- Note-taking strategies
- Computer based instruction
- Targeted review periods

In addition to special assistance offered prior to taking the CAHSEE, many SE teachers emphasized the importance of allowing accommodations for special education students during testing, or the need for differential standards for special education students. Some examples of these responses are provided below:

- There need to be differential standards for the truly handicapped kids.
- Maybe there should be a changed cut score to begin with, or have a different score for special education students.
- We need many accommodations to help them.
- The teacher would like to see a multiple diploma situation similar to that of New York, such as the Regents Diploma for those who pass the state's test. There are also vocational diplomas or certificates in a specific area.
- It would be important to allow students to use calculators if it is in their IEP.<sup>2</sup>
- There should be a modified version for anyone with an IEP. Test whether kids can analyze and get the main point at a lower level. This would be fairer than modifications with material that is beyond their reading level.
- The test could be broken down into sections rather than just English or math so that the students could pass fractions, for example, and not have to take that section again.
- They should give students more choices for the writing samples. Resource students need to have a choice of topics. Some topics are not within their experience.

Thirty-six of the 50 high and “other” school SE teachers indicated that their department uses the standards in developing students’ IEPs. Seventeen of the teachers indicated that they were *very familiar* with the California Content Standards, while 21 characterized themselves as *familiar* with the standards. Four teachers expressed familiarity with the standards but qualified the statement by saying that the standards were “largely irrelevant” for their special education students. These teachers noted that special education students typically function at lower grade levels, and that it was the teacher’s responsibility to put the individual students’ needs first. In one school, standards were not specifically used to determine IEPs, but were used to develop curriculum. Two noted that their department had just begun within the past year to use the standards to develop IEPs, and one of the teachers stated that the school was not yet using the standards completely. Some references were made to the use of the standards in writing goals and objectives for each student. Others noted that the standards were used but were modified to meet students’ specific needs. This often translated into the use of lower grade level standards. The following comments provide examples of the use of standards in developing IEPs:

- The California standards are used to develop IEPs. Goals are established for each standard in order for students to best meet the standard.

---

<sup>2</sup> Accommodations and modifications consistent with a student’s IEP or 504 Plan are allowed for the CAHSEE.

- The school is not specifically using the standards to determine IEPs. Teachers look first to the special needs of the individual to determine the IEP, then use the standards to develop curriculum.
- IEPs are written from the California Content Standards and teachers adjust the level of the standards to meet student needs.
- All goals and objectives were written to be aligned with the California Content Standards. They are aligned to the student's grade level content standards rather than at grade level standards.
- The goals and objectives of the IEPs are supposed to be based on the standards. I have to go back to the IEP and find where the student is. I find a standard that fits the student's level of achievement. I may have to go down to the 5<sup>th</sup> grade level to find a standard that is at the student's level.

High schools seemed to be making a concerted effort to expose their special education students to the California Content Standards. This usually involved “mainstreaming” special education students into general education courses, where they could be exposed to the same standards as the rest of their grade-level cohort. Often, as suggested in the previous section on IEPs, special education students were exposed to lower grade-level standards, in accordance with their individual needs.

In several schools, all Resource Specialist Program (RSP) students were mainstreamed in at least one subject area. In most situations, Special Day Class (SDC) students were at least mainstreamed in electives, such as physical education (PE). For schools that did not mainstream all their RSP students, more complete data are provided in the Appendix D along with data for those schools that did mainstream their SDC students in ELA or math. Overall, larger proportions of RSP than SDC students were mainstreamed in ELA and math.

The consensus was that all RSP students and some SDC students would be exposed to at least some of the content standards covered on the CAHSEE. Sixteen of 50 teachers stated that RSP students would be exposed to all the standards; 10 of those 16 teachers also stated that all special education students, including SDC, would be exposed to all content. Seventeen of 50 indicated that RSP students would be exposed to some of the standards. What was not always so clear was the grade level at which the standards were being covered. Typically, respondents noted that upper level math content would not be met. One teacher maintained that most special education students would not be exposed to any of the content standards. Within these general responses, there were a few clarifications, some of which are listed below:

- The SE students are exposed to all the standards; the opportunity is there.
- For SE students, getting to Geometry and some Algebra will be difficult.
- The SE students will be exposed, but perhaps not all at the level of the CAHSEE expectations.
- A lot of SE students won't have the opportunity of being exposed to a lot of the standards when they take the CAHSEE the first time.

- SDC students will never be exposed to Algebra content or higher level thinking because they can't read at a high enough level, and they can't retain information consistently or long enough for testing.

Though many high school teachers agreed that most special education students would be exposed to at least some of the required content, mastery of the content was viewed quite differently. Teachers generally agreed that special education students would not master the content necessary for passing the CAHSEE. Several indicated that math standards were the biggest obstacle to be overcome. One comment indicated that mastery is possible, with the appropriate accommodations. The following provide examples from the range of responses about student mastery of the content standards:

- I imagine that some of the SE students won't have mastered math by the time they take the CAHSEE for the first time—Geometry especially.
- Generally speaking, only 50 to 60 percent of the standards can be mastered when the SE students take the CAHSEE for the first time.
- As far as mastering the content SE students have been exposed to—the areas of math will be a problem.
- We can still cover all the CAHSEE standards at a reduced speed with special day students. They would be able to show mastery if they were allowed alternative modes of assessment.
- The mastery of content by SDC students relates to long- and short-term memory—a student may have mastery one day but not the next—it's a moving target.

Thirteen of the high school SE teachers indicated that none of their students had passed both portions of the CAHSEE. Of students that had passed at least one section of the exam, more students had more success in ELA than in math. A few relevant responses are provided here:

- No special education students have passed the math portion of the CAHSEE.
- 70 percent of SE students have taken the CAHSEE at least once and none of those students has passed yet.
- Probably 5 percent or less of SE students have passed both parts.
- I've had roughly nine SE students take the exit exam, and one passed both sections. Five of the others passed ELA, and one passed math.

Some respondents were able to make predictions in terms of how many of their students they expected would eventually pass the CAHSEE. These predictions varied, with some anticipating nearly complete success, others complete failure, and still others somewhere in the middle. Two teachers noted that if special education students were allowed accommodations, more would pass the CAHSEE. Representative comments are provided below:

- There may not even be 1 percent of special education students who will pass the CAHSEE.

- Eventually, over 90 percent of special day and over 90 percent of resource kids will pass.
- About 75 percent of SE students should be able to pass the test with accommodations, and about 50 percent will be able to pass both sections of the exam.
- Without modifications, none of this year's kids will pass. By just allowing the use of a calculator, which is what everyone does in real life, perhaps nine or 10 would pass.

**Middle-Grade Feeder Schools.** Nine of 20 middle-grade feeder school SE teachers stated that they used the California standards in developing their students' IEPs. Seven other teachers stated that they use the standards, but noted that the standards they use are usually below the students' grade levels. Two teachers made no mention of the IEPs specifically, but stated that they use the standards. Finally, two teachers stated that they focused on students' individual needs rather than the standards when developing IEPs. A few related comments are provided here:

- Goals and benchmarks have to be written to the content standards.
- The standards are written into the IEPs, but they are the standards for where the student is performing, not necessarily grade level.
- The content standards really don't come into play on IEPs; the focus is on the students' needs.

Nine of the 20 middle-grade feeder school SE teachers stated that some proportion of their students (RSP and/or SDC) was mainstreamed. Generally, more RSP students than SDC were mainstreamed, and RSP students were more likely to be mainstreamed in English and math. SDC students were often mainstreamed only in elective courses. Seven teachers stated that all of their RSP students were mainstreamed. Finally, one teacher stated that all special education students were mainstreamed, another stated that no SDC students were mainstreamed, and two teachers failed to provide information about mainstreaming at their school.

Nine of the 20 feeder school teachers stated that their students would be exposed to some portion of the California Content Standards. Similarly to high school teachers, some middle-grade feeder school SE teachers raised concerns over higher-level math standards.

All middle-grade feeder school SE teachers agreed that most of the special education students would not master all of the content necessary to pass the CAHSEE. Eight of 20 stated that their students would have trouble mastering all of the math standards, especially Algebra and word problems. Others mentioned subjects such as writing, spelling and vocabulary that would prove to be a roadblock.

Middle-grade feeder school SE teachers who spoke about the CAHSEE and its impact on both the Class of 2004 and their own students offered a variety of responses. In general, middle-grade feeder school teachers were not familiar with the details of the CAHSEE and its administration. Eight teachers focused on the need for accommodations or alternative diplomas for special education students. Three stated that the Class of 2004 was not ready to be held accountable. Three made predictions about their own students, two stating that most

of their students would be able to pass the CAHSEE, and the third stating that most students would go on to fail the exit exam. Some representative comments are provided below:

- From a special education point of view, I am very concerned about a mandated exit exam, particularly with not allowing accommodations.<sup>3</sup>
- The state probably should not hold the Class of 2004 accountable on the CAHSEE. But in upcoming years, the students will be better prepared for the CAHSEE.
- The school's RSP and SDC students will not be able to pass the CAHSEE when they get to high school. Students will have a better chance if the CAHSEE allows accommodations and they get a valid score.

### Targeted Programs for English Learners

The interviews with EL Teachers focused on those who taught courses offered to EL students as their primary or remedial ELA or math instruction covering standards tested on the CAHSEE. A total of 55 interviews were conducted with 40 high school, 13 middle-grade feeder school, and 2 “other” EL teachers.

#### High Schools

High school EL teachers mentioned several types of preparatory activities that were used in readying students for the CAHSEE, ranging from special programs to specific test-preparation activities. Some responses are listed below:

- An after school program is in place for students with limited English abilities.
- The school uses the Jean Schaeffer method.
- The teacher uses “Test Best,” which is CAT9 aligned.
- The school has a summer program for reading and writing.
- Tutors explicitly help students prepare to pass the CAHSEE. For example, one item was looking at a telephone page and answering questions. The students wonder why they need to do this because they'd just go on the Internet or call 411 for help. The tutor is helping them to understand why it is important to know how to do things “the test way.”

Some teachers mentioned using prepackaged test preparation materials, others used released test items, and still others drew from a variety of sources to prepare students in specific areas, such as vocabulary. Activities were created/assembled by a single teacher, created/assembled at the school or department level, or distributed by the district. The following responses illustrate the variety of ways that test preparation activities were developed:

- The teacher knows the topics on the exam and covers them in class prior to the exam.
- The teacher uses word lists provided by the English department, sample CAHSEE items, and skeletons for essay writing.

---

<sup>3</sup> Accommodations and modifications consistent with a student's IEP or 504 Plan are allowed for on the CAHSEE, so this is likely a misunderstanding on the teacher's part.

- The district provides the Kaplan test preparation series for use in the classes.
- Departments are working with the blueprint. Every school in the district is using “Word of the Day” to carry across the curriculum.
- Aside from working on comprehension and increasing vocabulary and grammar skills in general, the teacher does not specifically prepare students for the CAHSEE.

High and “other” school EL teachers indicated a variety of ways in which the California standards were integrated into EL curriculum. Several mentioned the use of textbooks and other materials as a guide in using the standards. As these texts usually listed the standards associated with each chapter, teachers were able to remain focused on the standards simply through the use of a standards-aligned text. The majority of responses indicated in non-specific terms that the standards were used, stating that the curriculum was standards-aligned, or that the standards were incorporated into instruction. A few of the more interesting responses are included below:

- The teacher uses quarterly writing rubrics based on the CAHSEE rubrics.
- The teacher was involved in groups that looked at regular standards and adapted them to levels that were doable for EL students. The groups worked from the California Content Standards and adapted them to create the ELD standards so they are very close.
- The district consults with teacher and committees to map ELD standards to California standards, and they are uniformly implemented across the district. Teachers are recording within courses what standards have been covered, and they are running end-of-unit tests to monitor progress.

Seven of the 26 EL teachers who were able to give an estimate of their ability to cover the California Content Standards with their EL students stated that their EL courses covered the same standards as their general education counterparts. Five of the 26 stated that EL standards were the focus at the lower EL levels, with a movement to the regular standards in higher-level EL courses. Two of these teachers noted that they make every effort to move their students into the higher EL levels as quickly as possible, in order to assure they are exposed to the California standards. Other teachers mentioned various proportions of the standards that they thought they would be able to cover with their students.

Thirty-five high school EL teachers indicated that at least some portion of the Class of 2004 had already passed or would be able to pass the CAHSEE. The following are a few comments made by teachers who were able to estimate the number of students that had passed/would pass the CAHSEE:

- I think the EL juniors are fine and have already passed it.
- Of 60 EL students, the teacher hopes all will take the math portion of the CAHSEE in March and thinks 30 to 40 percent will pass.
- The teacher thinks the Class of 2004 students will all pass except EL special education students.
- The 2004 requirement will not present a roadblock for this teacher’s EL students.



### Middle-Grade Feeder Schools

Though three middle-grade feeder school teachers stated that they were not very familiar with the CAHSEE, several others were aware of its importance and had begun preparing their students for the exam. Most of the preparatory activities mentioned were focused on test-taking strategies and familiarizing students with the testing scenario, as these comments illustrate:

- The teacher uses a book called *Scoring High* for reading and language. Many EL students have never had a standardized test and this really helps them understand the style of testing.
- The EL kids do STAR testing and the district conducts tests three times a year in core subjects.
- The teacher starts the EL students with the writing prompt (persuasion, literature) so they get used to seeing that every trimester.

Eleven of 13 middle-grade feeder school EL teachers stated that they used the California standards in their instruction. The standards were integrated into the curriculum in a variety of ways, a few of which are listed below:

- We integrate the standards in all kinds of ways: decoding strategies, phonics programs, reading strategies, writing strategies, WRITE program workshops. EL kids have to keep a portfolio. They prepare a research report that requires that they discuss how they met each of the standards.
- The textbooks are standards aligned.
- The entire school is behind the effort by encouraging things like listing the standards on the boards in the classrooms and pointing them out to the students when they are being covered.

Four of the 13 middle-grade feeder school EL teachers were able to make an estimate of their ability to cover all of the necessary standards in their course. The responses varied from less than half to all of the content standards being covered.

Middle-grade feeder school EL teachers were fairly evenly split in terms of their predictions about the 2004 CAHSEE requirement. Four stated that their current students would probably not be able to pass the CAHSEE, three stated that their students should have no problems passing, and three stated that student success would depend on their current EL level and their ability to advance through the EL program before taking the CAHSEE. The comments below are representative of the range of responses:

- The majority of EL students will not pass the CAHSEE when they get to 10<sup>th</sup> grade based on where they are right now.
- I am confident that the majority of EL students will pass the CAHSEE.
- If an EL student is a strong level 2 in the ELD program in 8<sup>th</sup> grade he or she should be able to pass the CAHSEE by the end of high school. If a student is low level 2 or 1 in the ELD program, it is less likely he or she will pass, but it depends on the educational background and support at the high school.



## Other Programs

The interviews with Special Program Teachers focused on those who taught courses or programs designed to help students considered at-risk of succeeding on the CAHSEE prior to their taking the exit exam. We conducted 42 interviews with 34 high school, 5 middle-grade feeder school, and 3 “other” special program teachers.

### High Schools

Depending on whether the program was structured as a single course, a before- or after-school program, or multiple courses, program length tended to vary. At 21 high schools, programs were structured as a single course that met during the school day; one course met during a seventh, after-school period. Eight other programs were conducted before or after regular school hours. Four programs were organized as a school-within-a-school, with multiple courses and/or multiple years. Some examples of program descriptions appear below:

- Advanced Linguistics is a scheduled full-year class for low performing readers.
- The class meets as a regular class on a block schedule for two hours.
- The tutoring program is a four-week program and students can enroll for before or after school.
- Students may be in the program during one, two or three class periods.

Programs that were organized as a single course tended to last one semester or one school year. Before- and after-school programs varied between a few weeks and an entire school year. Multiple course programs might last a year or more. Some responses are provided here:

- This is an entire semester course.
- There are several sections of Language Skills. The program lasts the entire year.
- Students attend four days a week for 1 hour and 15 minutes. They are supposed to remain for the entire year.
- The *Language! [Exclamation]* program takes 2 to 3 years to complete.

Program sizes range from 10 to 300 student participants. Schools serving a larger population of students might have several sections of an intervention course, each serving 20 or more students. Programs that were organized as a course were typically taken for elective credit.

Two of the three “other” programs were organized as single courses; the third was a school-within-a-school program.

Teachers from 20 of 34 high school and 1 of 3 “other” special programs stated that they used the California standards within their program. The following comments provide good representation of teacher input:

- This program attempts to integrate the students’ learning styles with the content standards.

- Initially this course was based more on national standards, but we have modified it for the CAHSEE standards.
- This course is about a 3 in implementing standards-based instruction on content, but it's a 5 on students feeling successful.
- One problem is that this program is not aligned with the California Content Standards.

Ten high school teachers made general comments about the difficulty that they expected students to have with the exam. Of the 13 who were able to give proportions, five stated that less than one-quarter would pass, four others estimated about one-half, and four estimated 75 to 90 percent. Two stated that students would pass depending on their level of participation or ability level. Two of the three “other” teachers commented that students who arrived at their school at an earlier age had a better chance of passing, simply by being in the system longer. The other stated that only one or two students might be able to pass the CAHSEE. The following comments provide a good representation of teachers’ comments:

- It will be very difficult for the students in this program to pass the CAHSEE.
- Students in this class have little chance of reaching the CAHSEE level competence.
- 25 percent of the students in this program have the potential to pass due to maturing.
- Probably 50 percent of my students can pass the CAHSEE.
- If current students remain in the program for the whole year-and-a-half, the coordinator hopes that approximately 80 percent will pass.
- In total, 90 percent will pass the exam.

#### **Middle-Grade Feeder Schools**

Three of the five middle-grade feeder school special program teachers described their program as a course, meeting for one period per day or as a two-period block. The two other special programs were organized more as a school-within-a-school program, with students meeting several periods each day.

Middle-grade feeder school programs served between 16 and 100 students. Three of the five programs served around 40 students.

Three of five middle-grade feeder school special program teachers stated that they used the California standards within their program. The remaining two teachers however, did not mention the standards. Comments about the use of standards are provided below:

- We use the California Content Standards for reading and writing and social studies. The program is driven by the California Content Standards.
- The California Content Standards were used in developing the standards for the program.
- The California standards are used for all English classes. Although this class is more skills based, we do use the standards.

Middle-grade feeder school respondents largely cited student-level factors, most of which were mirrored in the high school responses listed above, that presented challenges for their programs. However, parental education and participation also were mentioned by the middle-grade feeder schools as challenges to program success.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

Both survey and site visit results on the impact of the CAHSEE can be summarized in two key conclusions:

10. Coverage of the California Content Standards at both middle-grade feeder and high school levels has increased dramatically in the past three years. At the high school level, coverage of the particular standards assessed by the CAHSEE has also increased.
11. The number of remedial programs designed to help students who do not initially master relevant content standards has increased dramatically. These include a number of courses targeting special populations, in particular English learners and students with disabilities. A significant number of students are taking advantage of these courses.

While it is not possible to say that these changes were due entirely to the CAHSEE requirement, it is very unlikely that changes of this magnitude would have occurred without such a requirement. Many teachers and principals suggest that the requirement should be continued so that the momentum behind remedial instruction for students who have not yet mastered essential skills can be maintained.

